



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,267	03/26/2004	Andrew Kapochunas	384.7817USU	8528

7590 02/25/2008
Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

PARDO, THUY N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/810,267	Applicant(s) KAPOCHUNAS ET AL.	
	Examiner Thuy N. Pardo	Art Unit 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,11,12,14,18-20 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 11, 12, 14, 18-20 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 13, 2007 has been entered. In the amendment filed on November 13, 2007, claims 1, 3-8, 11, 12, 14, 18-20 and 22-24 are pending in the application, claims 1, 3-8, 11, 12, 14, 18-20 are amended, claims 2, 9, 10, 13, 15-17 and 21 are canceled, and claims 22-24 are added. This Office Action is made Non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 12, 14, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. (Hereinafter "Clark") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0153663, in view of Monteverde US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088553.

As to claim 1, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:
receiving at least one input address [obtain street address information, 10 of fig. 1; 0040;
comparing said at least one input address to at least one standard [compare to old street address or a
reference address, 12 of fig. 1; 22-80 of fig. 2; 0041].

However, Clark does not explicitly teach providing a single best address derived from
said at least one input address based on said comparison although it has the same functionality of
performing updating address file based on the addresses comparison [84 of fig. 2]. Monteverde
teaches providing a single best address derived from said at least one input address based on said
comparison [determine the best site(s) based on the “search term” matches and then display it to
the user, see the abstract; 6 of fig. 2; 13 of fig. 3; 21 of fig. 5; 0036].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art
at the time of the invention to add the feature of Monteverde for comparing each Internet site
(i.e., address) with a “search term” (i.e., standard or criteria) to provide the best Internet site
address to Clark’s system of providing a new address (updated address) based on all information
of both addresses- current address and “change to” address. The motivation being to expand and
enhance the versatility of Clark's system to provide the best accurate address based on the
comparison. Clark further teaches matching said single best address to a database having unique
business identifiers associated with addresses to find a matching address and providing said matching
address [0032-0034; 0043], and Monteverde further teaches matching said single best address to a
database having unique business identifiers associated with addresses to find a matching address and
providing a matching address for correction of said input address [update the database and provide

Art Unit: 2168

the searcher's with the most relevant Internet site(s) for any given search term based upon prior results, 0016; 0036].

As to claim 3, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said database is an advanced office system (AOS) [0041].

As to claim 4, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches providing a match project analysis report [0290; 0296; 0301].

As to claim 5, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches converting said at least one input address to a predetermined record layout, before comparing said input address to said at least one standard [30-80 of fig. 2].

As to claim 6, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches associating said at least one input address with at least one code, said code being used to determine said single best address [0051-0081; 0094-0103].

As to claim 7, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches associating said at least one input address with at least one score, said score being used to determine said single best address [0222-0223; fig. 19-15].

As to claim 8, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said at least one standard is at least one selected from the group consisting of: ZIP+4 coding, coding accuracy support system (CASS), Locatable Address Conversion System (LACS), delivery sequence file (DSF), and National Change of Address (NCOA) [0041-0042].

As to claim 14, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches an investigator for investigating any address not matched, upon request [0031; 0036].

As to claim 18, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said view is at least one selected from the group consisting of: alphabetical, most frequent content, and alpha characters only [0032-0034; 0036].

As to claims 11, 12 and 19 and 20, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

3. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. (Hereinafter "Clark") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0153663, in view of Monteverde US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088553, in further view of Burdick et al. (Hereinafter "Burdick") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0107205.

As to claim 22, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of accessing a record having said input address and correcting said record based on said matching address although it has the same functionality of performing updating address file based on the addresses comparison. Burdick teaches accessing a record having said input address and correcting said record based on said matching address [0057-0067]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Burdick to Clark-Monteverde's system as an essential means to provide a new address (updated address) based on all information of both addresses- current address and "change to" address.

As to claims 23 and 24, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy N. Pardo whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2168

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thuy N Pardo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2168

/Thuy N Pardo/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168